

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/047,024	WIELSTRA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel S. Metzmaier	1712	

All Participants:

(1) Daniel S. Metzmaier.

(2) John C. Fox.

Status of Application: Appealed

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 October 2006

Time: ~ 12:00 PM

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
none.

Claims discussed:
Claim 11.


Prior art documents discussed:
none.

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 DANIEL S. METZMAIER
 PRIMARY EXAMINER
 ART UNIT 1712

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: examiner noted that the dependency of claim 11 was inadvertently dropped on 16 July 2004 amendment and a correct set of the claims would include the dependency of claim 11 on claim 10, which appears to be applicants' intent. Said amendment would be proper since it places the case in better form for appeal.